Reply filed: November 9, 2004

Docket No. 3659-0137PUS1 Applic. No. 10/700,114

Art Unit 2833

Page 8 of 11

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given

the present application. Claims 1-3, 5 and 7-14 are currently being

prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection

in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner considers the subject

matter of claims 7, 11 and 12 as being allowable and the subject matter of

claim 4 as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Although not

conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections, claim 1 has been

amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 4. Accordingly, claims 1-

3, 5 and 7-14 are now in condition for allowance.

ELECTION OF SPECIES

Due to the election of species required by the Examiner in the action of

May 19, 2004, the Examiner has withdrawn from consideration claims 2, 3, 6,

8-10 and 13. The Applicant submits that these claims should now be included

in the considered claims. The Applicant's response filed on July 11, 2004,

indicated that the first species, shown in figures 1-10 was elected and that

claims 1, 4-7 and 11-12 are included. The Examiner indicated that claim 6

also does not relate to the species. However, neither the Examiner nor the

Reply filed: November 9, 2004

Docket No. 3659-0137PUS1 Applic. No. 10/700,114

Art Unit 2833

Page 9 of 11

Applicant has previously indicated the presence of generic claims. In fact, both

independent claims 1 and 7 as originally presented relate to all four

embodiments. Claims 2, 3 and 8-10 relate only to the second and third

embodiments. Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 relate to embodiments 1-3 and claims 6

and 13 relate only to embodiment 4. Since the limitations of claim 4 have now

been added to claim 1, claim 1 is still generic to the first three embodiments.

Accordingly, claims 2, 3 and 5 properly should not be considered and are also

allowable since they depend from an allowable independent claim. Claim 7 is

still generic to all four embodiments so that claims 8-13 should all be

considered with this claim and are also allowable since they depend therefrom.

Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form as claim 14. This claim

relates only to the fourth embodiment since it describes the insertion element

as a printed circuit board. However, the Applicant submits that this claim

should also be considered by the Examiner since dependent claim 13 is now

being considered since it depends from a generic claim. Thus, claim 13 acts as

a linking claim to claim 14. Accordingly, consideration of all the claims is

respectfully requested.

Reply filed: November 9, 2004

Docket No. 3659-0137PUS1 Applic. No. 10/700,114

Art Unit 2833

Page 10 of 11

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated

by Daikuhara et al. (U.S. Patent 6,183,302). This rejection is respectfully

traversed.

Since the Examiner has indicated that claim 4 is allowable if rewritten in

independent form and since claim 1 has been amended to include this

limitation, this rejection is overcome.

In regard to new claim 14, the Applicant submits that this reference also

does not show the use of the printed circuit board and accordingly this claim is

likewise allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly

distinguish over the patent relied on by the Examiner. In view of this,

reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims are respectfully

requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the

present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F.

Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to

conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the

present application.

Reply filed: November 9, 2004

Docket No. 3659-0137PUS1 Applic. No. 10/700,114

Art Unit 2833

Page 11 of 11

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Bv

Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

M

KM/RFG/te 3659-0137PUS1